



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,409	05/18/2000	John H. Green	13498(CA19980001US1)	7915

7590 02/14/2003

Richard L Catania Esq  
Scully Scott Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/574,409

Applicant(s)

GREEN ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) p. 1 – 4.

**As to claim 17 and 26**, the APA teaches interfacing (mapping, p. 2 line 21) a program on an IMS system (IMS programs to C++, p. 2 lines 15 - 20) to a program in another program environment, converting (mapping, p. 2 line 21 - 22) data between the IMS transaction and the program in another program environment. The APA teaches perform transactions with the program on the IMS system (perform transactions with these COBOL IMS program, p. 2 line 17).

The APA does not explicitly cite invoking an IMS transaction.

It would have been obvious that it has to invoke an IMS transaction to perform said transactions.

**As to claim 18 and 27**, the APA teaches translating (translate, p. 2 lines 24 - 27) data type of the program in another program environment to data types used in a message to the IMS system, composing the message (message format, p. 2 line 30 - 32), translating (translate the data from IMS to the other computer language, p. 2 line 1 -

4) data from IMS system to another program system, reading the message from IMS (read the returned data before translating, p. 3 lines 1 - 4).

**As to claim 20**, it would have been obvious to convert the data by code pages.

**As to claim 1 and 8**, see claim 17 above. Further, the APA teaches generating a program interface (used for mapping, p. 2).

The APA does not explicitly teach scanning.

It would have been obvious that it has to read the transaction before translating (translating, p. 2).

**As to claim 7 and 14**, see claim 20 above.

**As to claim 21**, it would have been obvious to have program code to execute the method steps of claim 1.

**As to claim 5 and 12**, the APA teaches mapping. It would have been obvious comprising compiling interface so it can run.

2. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 22 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA), and in view of Page, US patent no. 5,812,768.

**As to claim 19**, Page converting comprises accessing the IMS transaction via the MSSeries (message queue, col. 46 line 1 - 15) message interface.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Page to the APA's system because the system can process many messages.

**As to claim 2 and 9**, Page teaches a transaction part (broker, col. 45 - 47) reading (reading before translating, col. 46 lines 61 - 67), and dynamic composing reading (dynamic, col. 47 lines 65 - 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Page to the APA's system because the system can dynamically process an IMS message.

**As to claim 3 and 10**, the APA teaches translating (translate, p. 2) data types of the program in another program environment to data types used in a message to the IMS system.

The APA does not teach the steps of providing a runtime,

Page teaches mapping at runtime (run-time, col. 47 lines 65 - 67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Page to the APA's system because the system can dynamically process an IMS message.

**As to claim 4 and 11**, see claim 19 above.

**As to claim 6 and 13**, Page teaches mapping at runtime. It would have been obvious comprising compiling interface at runtime.

**As to claim 22**, see claim 8 above.

**As to claim 23**, see claim 3 above.

**As to claim 15 and 24**, see claim 8 above.

Further, the APA teaches producing a data description (stubs, p. 4 lines 1 - 2) using said data description to generate code for invoking said IMS transaction (stub is interface used to invoke IMS transaction).

**As to claim 16 and 25**, the APA teaches the data description to generate code to process (exchange, p. 4 lines 1 - 5) message of said IMS for used with another language environment (CICS).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on (703)305-9716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

ph  
February 10, 2003



**ALVIN OBERLEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**